

10 February 1956

Mr. Phillips Ketchum

Boston, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Ketchum:

Referring to our telephone conversation of yesterday, I have tried my hand at a redraft of a statement on behalf of Dr. Killian, which corresponds more directly to the points raised in the letter to Senator Ives which is now making the rounds on Capitol Hill.

I have done this before receiving the material you are sending to me, because we may have a problem on timing and I did want to get a draft into your hands which you and I could discuss by 'phone. I have not sent a copy of this draft to Dr. Killian directly, but would very much appreciate it if you would check it with him if you consider it desirable before we put the product in final shape. As I indicated to you yesterday, this memorandum is not going to be circulated on the Hill, but is to be available for transmission to friendly Senators in the event that someone decides to bring this matter up on the Floor in connection with the debate on the Mansfield Resolution for a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence.

Needless to say, I have no pride of authorship. I will call you the first of next week and will make any changes that you or Dr. Killian may desire.

Sincerely yours,

Norman S. Paul  
Legislative Counsel

Attachment  
IG:NSP/blc  
Orig. - Add  
2 - Signer ✓  
1 - Inspector General

**SUMMARY STATEMENT BY DR. J. R. KILLIAN, JR. REGARDING ALLEGATIONS  
MADE CONCERNING HIM BY NEWSMAN FULTON LEWIS, JR.**

Mr. Lewis has stated that in April 1947 I filed a statement before the Committee on Rules of the Massachusetts General Court opposing legislation to ban members of subversive organizations from state employment, opposing compilation of a list of subversive organizations by the State Attorney General, and opposing the establishment of a state committee on subversive activities.

After a thorough search of all available files and records, I am unable to find any legislation proposed on these subjects at the date in question, other than a proposal for the establishment of a state commission on subversive activities. Nor am I able to find a copy of any statement made by me on the occasion described by Mr. Lewis, and I have no personal recollection of having made such a statement. At a later date, when the Massachusetts State Legislature did establish a state commission on communism, I gave this commission full cooperation whenever I was called upon to be of help to it.

Mr. Lewis has referred to another statement which I made in February 1948, opposing "anti-communist legislation which would bar Reds from teaching in Massachusetts."

I did make a statement at that time, as did Dr. Conant, President of Harvard, and the heads of other major educational institutions in Massachusetts. The position that I took on that occasion, opposing what was then known as the Barnes Bill, was done at the request of the then President of

of the Institute, Dr. Earl T. Compton, and I appeared in his behalf to express our common views. The opposition which I expressed to the bill in behalf of the corporation of the Institute was directed primarily at its unworkability, to its technical looseness as a bill, and to the requirements it would have imposed upon the colleges and universities in the state to undertake policing responsibilities beyond their competence. The bills which I and others are listed as having opposed did not pass the State Legislature. As I stated above, when the Legislature did enact a carefully planned and considered bill for the establishment of a state commission on communism, I gave this commission full cooperation and support.

Mr. Lewis has referred to a statement in the Daily Worker (a dubious source of facts) about the case of Dirk J. Struik, which quotes me as saying that the removal of a university instructor for his personal beliefs would be a violation of academic freedom.

In 1949, shortly after the name of Dr. Struik, a faculty member of M.I.T., had been mentioned by a witness in the trial of eleven Communist leaders in New York, I issued a statement making explicit the policy of the Institute regarding subversion of its faculty. In that statement I emphasized that the Institute is unequivocally opposed to communism, and that it is also sternly opposed to the Communistic method of dictating to scholars the opinions they must have and the doctrines they must teach. With respect to Dr. Struik, who was not at that time under indictment for any offense and who had denied that he had committed acts improper for an American citizen, I stated the belief of the Institute that he should be considered innocent of any criminal action unless he is proved guilty.

Mr. Lewis neglected to report, in implying a softness toward communism in this episode, that when a legal case was brought against Professor Struik, he was promptly suspended as a member of the faculty at MIT and continues to be on suspension, having no contact with students and no responsibilities at MIT. Because an indictment against him is pending in the courts, legal counsel of the Institute have advised that we should not engage in any public discussion of his case because of the possibility that such discussions might be construed as being prejudicial either to his case or to that of the state against him.

Mr. Lewis has stated that during the 1954 Gray Board hearings on the Oppenheimer case, I signed an affidavit in which I stated Dr. Oppenheimer was "a man deeply devoted to strengthening the security of the nation."

This quotation should not be made out of context with the circumstances under which the affidavit was made, or the true picture of my relationships and contacts with Dr. Oppenheimer prior to that time.

The affidavit which was introduced in the Oppenheimer hearings was a factual statement about my experiences and observations of those times when I saw him in action, and the above quotation was explicitly related to my impressions at meetings which Dr. Oppenheimer and I attended. It was written without any knowledge of the testimony presented at the hearings, or of the conclusions subsequently reached by the Gray Committee. I never knew Oppenheimer well and I had only come in contact with him fortuitously as a result of his having been invited by my predecessor to give a lecture at M.I.T. and as a result of my appointment on the Science Advisory Committee, to which he also had been appointed by President Truman. I had nothing to do with his appointment to this Committee.

Mr. Lewis implies that on my part there was something planned or contrived in the fact that I attended meetings at which Oppenheimer was present. I had done so for the simple reason that I was discharging duties as a member of a committee appointed by the President. I had at no time sought Oppenheimer out or myself arranged any meetings with him. As stated in my affidavit, on those occasions when I did see him, I observed no evidence that would raise questions about his loyalty or integrity. I have not seen Oppenheimer or talked with him since the Atomic Energy Commission hearing, or for that matter since he was denied clearance and therefore was barred from attending meetings of the Science Advisory Committee.

If one wishes to make an examination of my affirmative attitudes and actions with respect to communism, security, and the defense of the United States, one can find evidence of sustained opposition to communism, consistent advocacy of strengthening the military position of the United States to keep us superior in all respects to the Russians, and a series of specific assignments which have been devoted to strengthening the United States and combatting Russia in the cold war. A number of these assignments have been in the classified area, and I am not at liberty to describe them. If it becomes necessary, I would assume that the White House or other appropriate officers in Government might indicate the fact that I have been engaged in efforts under the auspices of the President which have stressed the importance of our building further military strength, which

have included recommendations which have been acted upon by the National Security Council, and which have involved contributions to increasing the effectiveness of our intelligence. I am sure that no one who knows the contents of the report of the technological capabilities panel could have any doubt about their being utterly lacking in any softness toward the enemies of the United States. These are facts which I cannot express because of the circumscriptions of security, but people in the administration can if it becomes necessary and I believe could do so without revealing any secrets.

Finally, one of the most extensive statements that I have made in regard to our own view of our current situation vis-a-vis the Russians may be found in the first of a series of lectures which I gave at Harvard this last summer on science and national security. In this lecture I urged that we not let the peaceful overtures of the Russians or the discussions of disarmament slacken in any way our drive to build our military strength and to maintain superiority over the Russians. I emphasized and reiterated that we have no choice but to be taut and alert in resisting the Soviets. This has been my general view throughout. It has led me to accept such extracurricular assignments as the chairmanship of the Scientific Advisory Panel of the Army, as the Chairman of an Advisory Board on Research and Development during the chairmanship of Mr. Webster. It led me to undertake a special assignment of a highly classified nature for Mr. Lovett when he was Secretary of Defense. It has led me to support in every way I could the effective use of the resources of M.I.T. to strengthen our national defense, and it has led me to encourage and participate in various activities directed toward mobilizing our scientific resources for the

improvement of our intelligence effort.

If you wish documentation on these positive aspects of my attitude toward communism and toward the defense of the United States, it can be done, and the record will be extensive.